



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,673	04/13/2001	Shunpei Yamazaki	12732-029001	2129

26171 7590 08/22/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
11TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500

EXAMINER

MENGISTU, AMARE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2673

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PD

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/833,673

Applicant(s)

YAMAZAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Amare Mengistu

Art Unit

2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,8,9,12 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5,6,10 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7 and 10.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of species III in Paper No. 11 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 14-18 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 11.
3. This application contains claims 14-18 are drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 11. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Specification

- 4 The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the recitation of claim 1 "a plurality of pixels, **thereby resulting in brightness of the plurlaity of pixels being changed**" does not provide support in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Osaka** (4,308,556).

As to claim 1, Osaka clearly teaches wherein a polarity of a video signal to be input into the plurality of pixels is inverted (col.2, lines 47-54), thereby resulting in brightness of the plurality of pixels being changed (col.3, lines 24-27, col.4, lines 13-18, it is inherent that the display has a plurality of pixels).

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipate by **Matsushima et al** (6,396,468) (figs. 1-5)

Art Unit: 2673

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by **Jeong** (6,373,459) (see, figs.3, col.2, lines 56- col.3, lines 5, lines 49- col.4, lines – col.4, lines 28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Osaka** in view of **Jacobsen et al** (6,486,862).

As to claims 2 and 3, Osaka teaches inverting the video signals for a television, but has failed to teach that the display being a light emitting device and the display device can be video camera, head up display, telephone or personal computer. However, the patent of Jacobsen et al is cited to teach that it is well known for a

Art Unit: 2673

telephone, camera or head up display to have be a light emitting display type (see, Abstract, col.1, lines 15-24, figs. 4,8,9, and 20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to modify display system of **Osaka** by the multi-display system of **Jacobsen et al** because this will allow the user have a compact multi display system easy to carry system to provide convenience.

10. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Matsushima et al** in view of **Jacobsen et al** (6,486,862).

As to claims 7 and 8, **Matsushima et al** teaches inverting the video signals for a LCD, but has failed to teach that the display being a light emitting device and the display device can be video camera, head up display, telephone or personal computer. However, the patent of **Jacobsen et al** is cited to teach that it is well known for a telephone, camera or head up display to have be a light emitting display type (see, Abstract, col.1, lines 15-24, figs. 4,8,9, and 20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to modify display system of **Matsushima et al** by the multi-display system of **Jacobsen et al** because this will allow the user have a compact multi display system easy to carry system to provide convenience.

11. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Jeong** in view of **Jacobsen et al** (6,486,862).

As to claims 12 and 13, **Jeong** teaches inverting the video signals for a LCD, but has failed to teach that the display being a light emitting device and the display device can be video camera, head up display, telephone or personal computer. However, the patent of **Jacobsen et al** is cited to teach that it is well known for a telephone, camera or head up display to have be a light emitting display type (see, Abstract, col.1, lines 15-24, figs. 4,8,9, and 20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to modify display system of **Jeong** by the multi-display system of Jacobsen et al because this will allow the user have a compact multi display system easy to carry system to provide convenience.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 5,6,10 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

13. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior arts, (**Osaka, Matsushima et al, Jeong and Jacobsen et al**) has failed to teach applicant's claimed invention "*said switching circuit comprises an inverter, a first analog switch, and a second analog switch, said video signal input into said switching circuit is input into an input terminal of said first analog switch through said inverter, signal output from output terminals of said first analog switch and said second analog switch are output from said switching circuit*"; "*said switching circuit*


Art Unit: 2673

comprises an inverter, a NAND, and a second NAND, and NOR, said first NAND is supplied with said video signal through said inverter and said shift signal, ...signal output from said NOR is output from said switching circuit".

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amare Mengistu whose telephone number is (703) 305-4880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, T-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.


Amare Mengistu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2673

A.M